UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/932,227	09/17/1997	ERIC T. FOSSEL	S1509.70029US00	5092
	7590 11/17/201 IFIELD & SACKS, P.(EXAMINER		
600 ATLANTIC	C AVENUE	MULLIS, JEFFREY C		
BOSTON, MA 02210-2206			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1796	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/17/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	08/932,227	FOSSEL, ERIC T.
Examiner initiated interview duminary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jeffrey C. Mullis	1765
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_
(1) <u>Jeffrey C. Mullis</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Tani Chen</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 10 November 2010	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: .	cant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: none		
Prior art documents discussed: nione		
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa 	ne examiner will provide a written record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
/Jeffrey C. Mullis/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1765	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicants attorney was contacted on 5-5-10 to determine if the IDS of 5-5-10 had been received by applicants after consideration by the Office and if not whether the French patents cited therein contained the concise explanation required by the Office for foreign language references. On 11-10-10 applicants attorney contacted the examiner and said that no initialed IDS had been received by applicants not was there a concise explanation for the French patents. Applicants attorney was informed that the French patens would therefore not be considered and would be crossed out.